

# arXivEdits: Understanding the Human Revision Process in Scientific Writing

Chao Jiang, Wei Xu, and Samuel Stevens



# Revision in Scientific Writing

Two adjacent versions of the same paper on arXiv (an open-access E-print service)

arXiv > cs > arXiv:1706.03762 Search...  
Help | Adv

Computer Science > Computation and Language

*[Submitted on 12 Jun 2017 (v1), last revised 6 Dec 2017 (this version, v5)]*

## Attention Is All You Need


Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, Illia Polosukhin

The dominant sequence transduction models are based on complex recurrent or convolutional neural networks in an encoder–decoder configuration. The best performing models also connect the encoder and decoder through an attention mechanism. We propose a new simple network architecture, the Transformer, based solely on attention mechanisms, dispensing with recurrence and convolutions entirely. Experiments on two machine translation tasks show these models to be superior in quality while being more parallelizable and requiring significantly less time to train. Our model achieves 28.4 BLEU on the WMT 2014 English–to–German translation task, improving over the existing best results, including ensembles by over 2 BLEU. On the WMT 2014 English–to–French translation task, our model establishes a new single–model state–of–the–art BLEU score of 41.8 after training for 3.5 days on eight GPUs, a small fraction of the training costs of the best models from the literature. We show that the Transformer generalizes well to other tasks by applying it successfully to English constituency parsing both with large and limited training data.

Comments: 15 pages, 5 figures  
Subjects: **Computation and Language (cs.CL)**; Machine Learning (cs.LG)  
Cite as: [arXiv:1706.03762 \[cs.CL\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03762)  
(or [arXiv:1706.03762v5 \[cs.CL\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03762v5) for this version)  
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1706.03762> ⓘ

**Submission history**  
From: Ashish Vaswani [[view email](#)]  
[v1] Mon, 12 Jun 2017 17:57:34 UTC (1,102 KB)  
[v2] Mon, 19 Jun 2017 16:49:45 UTC (1,125 KB)  
[v3] Tue, 20 Jun 2017 05:20:02 UTC (1,125 KB)  
[v4] Fri, 30 Jun 2017 17:29:30 UTC (1,124 KB)  
[v5] Wed, 6 Dec 2017 03:30:32 UTC (1,124 KB)

**Submission history**  
From: Ashish Vaswani [[view email](#)]  
[v1] Mon, 12 Jun 2017 17:57:34 UTC (1,102 KB)  
[v2] Mon, 19 Jun 2017 16:49:45 UTC (1,125 KB)  
[v3] Tue, 20 Jun 2017 05:20:02 UTC (1,125 KB)  
[v4] Fri, 30 Jun 2017 17:29:30 UTC (1,124 KB)  
[v5] Wed, 6 Dec 2017 03:30:32 UTC (1,124 KB)



# What are the Revisions?

- Document-level Revision:

## A Paragraph in Early Draft

(s1) Energy markets are driven by innovation, path-dependent technology costs and diffusion; yet, common optimisation modelling methodologies remain vague on these aspects and have a limited ability to address the effectiveness of policy onto decision-making since the latter is not specifically represented. (s2) This leads to an underestimation of non-cost-optimal technology lock-ins known to occur. (s3) ~~Breaking with tradition, our approach explores bottom-up ...~~


## Operation

s1 → Split & Revise → t1  
 s1 → Split & Revise → t2  
 s2 → Revise → t3  
 s3 → Deletion  
 Insertion → t4

## The Paragraph in Final Version

(t1) Energy markets are driven by innovation, path-dependent technology choices and diffusion. (t2) However, conventional optimisation models lack detail on these aspects and have limited ability to address the effectiveness of policy interventions because they do not represent decision-making. (t3) As a result, known effects of technology lock-ins are liable to be underestimated. (t4) In contrast, our approach places investor decision-making ...

- Sentence-level Revision with Intention:



# Study Revision is **Useful**

- Valuable Knowledge is Encoded.
  - Document-level: logical and structural improvement.
  - Sentence-level: stylistic and grammatical refinement.
- Support Important Applications
  - Writing quality assessment and grammar error correction ([Bryant et al., 2019](#)).
  - AI-assist writing ([Sun et al., 2021](#), [Du et al., 2022](#), [Huang et al., 2022](#)).
  - Text simplification and compression ([Xu et al., 2015](#), [Maddela., 2021](#)).
  - Stale transfer and paraphrase generation ([Xu et al., 2012](#), [Dou et al., 2022](#)).
  - And many more ...

# Our Work

A complete computational framework to study text revision in the scientific writing domain.

# Our Work

A complete computational framework to study text revision in the scientific writing domain.

## arXivEdits

- Sentence alignment for 751 paper groups across 6 research areas in 23 years. **Full multi-page papers!**
- Fine-grained sentence level edits with intentions for 1,000 sentence pairs. **New intention taxonomy!**

# Our Work

A complete computational framework to study text revision in the scientific writing domain.

## arXivEdits

- Sentence alignment for 751 paper groups across 6 research areas in 23 years. **Full multi-page papers!**
- Fine-grained sentence level edits with intentions for 1,000 sentence pairs. **New intention taxonomy!**

## System

- Automatic sentence alignment. **Precision: 96.9; F1 93.8**
- Span-level edit extraction. **More explainable!**
- Edit intention classification.

# Our Work

A complete computational framework to study text revision in the scientific writing domain.

## arXivEdits

- Sentence alignment for 751 paper groups across 6 research areas in 23 years. **Full multi-page papers!**
- Fine-grained sentence level edits with intentions for 1,000 sentence pairs. **New intention taxonomy!**

## System

- Automatic sentence alignment. **Precision: 96.9; F1 93.8**
- Span-level edit extraction. **More explainable!**
- Edit intention classification.

## Data-driven Analysis

*What common strategies are used by authors to improve the writing of their papers?*




# Sentence alignment can capture all document-level revision operations

### A Paragraph in Early Draft

(s1) Energy markets are driven by innovation, path-dependent technology costs and diffusion; yet, common optimisation modelling methodologies remain vague on these aspects and have a limited ability to address the effectiveness of policy onto decision-making since the latter is not specifically represented. (s2) This leads to an underestimation of non-cost-optimal technology lock-ins known to occur. (s3) ~~Breaking with tradition, our approach explores bottom-up...~~

### Operation



### The Paragraph in Final Version

(t1) Energy markets are driven by innovation, path-dependent technology choices and diffusion. (t2) However, conventional optimisation models lack detail on these aspects and have limited ability to address the effectiveness of policy interventions because they do not represent decision-making. (t3) As a result, known effects of technology lock-ins are liable to be underestimated. (t4) In contrast, our approach places investor decision-making ...

# Annotating Sentence Alignment in arXivEdits

Step 1: Extract plain text from the latex source code with Pandoc library. **Improved!**

Step 2: Align paragraphs for papers in adjacent versions using a light-weighted algorithm.

Step 3: Crowdsource alignment labels for sentence pairs on Figure-Eight

- Classify sentence pairs into *aligned* / *partially-aligned* / *not-aligned*
- Inter-annotator agreement: 0.614 (Cohen Kappa)

---

## Algorithm 1: Paragraph Alignment Algorithm

---

```
Initialize:  $alignP \in \mathbb{I}^{k \times l}$  to  $0^{k \times l}$   
Initialize:  $simP \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times k \times l}$  to  $0^{2 \times k \times l}$   
for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $k$  do  
  for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $l$  do  
     $simP[1, i, j] = \text{avg}_{s_p \in S_i} \left( \max_{c_q \in C_j} simSent(s_p, c_q) \right)$   
     $simP[2, i, j] = \text{avg}_{c_p \in C_i} \left( \max_{s_q \in S_j} simSent(s_p, c_q) \right)$   
  end  
end  
for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $l$  do  
   $i_{max} = \text{argmax}_i simP[2, i, j]$   
  if  $simP[1, i_{max}, j] > \tau_1$  and  $d(i_{max}, j) < \tau_2$  then  
    then  
    |  $alignP[i_{max}, j] = 1$   
  else if  $simP[1, i_{max}, j] > \tau_3$  then  
    |  $alignP[i_{max}, j] = 1$   
  end  
for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $k$  do  
   $j_{max} = \text{argmax}_j simP[1, i, j]$   
  if  $simP[2, i, j_{max}] > \tau_1$  and  $d(i, j_{max}) < \tau_4$  then  
    then  
    |  $alignP[i, j_{max}] = 1$   
  else if  $simP[2, i, j_{max}] > \tau_3$  then  
    |  $alignP[i, j_{max}] = 1$   
  end  
end  
return  $alignP$ 
```

---

# Crowdsourcing Annotation Interface

## Sentence A

The proposed method can be applied to find relations of the derived type giving possibility to search for other heavy virtual states .

## Sentence B

The proposed method can be applied to find the relations of the derived type for different effective four-fermion operators generated by the [MATH] ( for instance , discussed in Refs. [CITATION] )

## What's the relationship between Sentence A and Sentence B ?

**A and B are equivalent**

- A and B are equivalent (convey the same meaning, though one sentence can be much shorter or simpler than the other sentence)

**A , B are partially overlapped**

- A and B are partially overlap (share information in common, while some important information differs/missing).

**A and B are mismatched**

- The two sentences are completely dissimilar in meaning.

## Comments (Optional)

If you have any comment about this HIT, please type it here

# Diverse Document-level Edit Operation

<b>Operation</b>	<b>Count</b>
Insertion (0-to-1)	25,229
Deletion (1-to-0)	17,315
Rephrasing (1-to-1)	17,755
Splitting (1-to-n)	378
Merging (n-to-1)	269
Fusion (m-to-n)	142
Copying (1-to-1)	95,110

# Automatic Sentence Alignment

The Neural CRF sentence alignment model trained on our data performs best.

Methods	Precision	Recall	F1
Char. 3-gram (Štajner et al.)	87.7	87.7	87.7
TF-IDF (Paetzold et al.)	90.3	<b>91.6</b>	<u>90.9</u>
Jaccard (Xu et al.)	<u>90.7</u>	89.5	90.1
BLEU (Faruqui et al.)	89.9	89.6	89.8
Neural CRF aligner (ours)	<b>96.9</b>	<u>91.0</u>	<b>93.8</b>

- The precision of our model is particularly high, indicating that it can be reliably used to extract high-quality aligned sentence pairs.

# Edit Intention Taxonomy for Scientific Writing

Cost-optimisation technology models , correspondence with [CITATION] , is the most powerful for finding with outstanding detail lowest cost future technology pathways.

Cost-optimisation technology models , corresponding to [CITATION] , are still the most powerful tools for finding detailed , lowest-cost future technology pathways that reaches particular objectives in normative mode .

# Edit Intention Taxonomy for Scientific Writing

Cost-optimisation technology models, **correspondence with [CITATION]**, **is** the most powerful for finding **with outstanding detail lowest cost** future technology pathways.

Cost-optimisation technology models, **corresponding to [CITATION]**, **are still** the most powerful **tools** for finding **detailed , lowest-cost** future technology pathways **that reaches** **particular objectives in normative mode** .


# Edit Intention Taxonomy for Scientific Writing

Cost-optimisation technology models, **correspondence with** [CITATION], **is** the most powerful for finding **with outstanding detail** **lowest cost** future technology pathways.

Cost-optimisation technology models, **corresponding to** [CITATION], **are** still the most powerful **tools** for finding **detailed**, **lowest-cost** future technology pathways **that reaches** particular objectives in normative mode.




# Edit Intention Taxonomy for Scientific Writing



If run over the entire arXiv, can extract > 7M language-related edits at 65% accuracy.

Intention	Definition	%
<b>Improve Language</b>		28.6%
More Accurate/specific	Minor adjustment to improve the accuracy or specificness of the description.	11.5%
Improve Style	Make the text sound more professional or coherent without altering the meaning.	8.7%
Simplify	Simplify complex concepts or delete redundant content to improve readability.	7.6%
Other	Other language improvements that don't fall into the above categories.	0.8%
<b>Correct Grammer/Typo</b>	Fix grammatical errors, correct typos, or smooth out grammar needed by other changes.	25.4%
<b>Update Content</b>	Update large amount of scientific content, add or delete major fact.	28.8%
<b>Adjust Format</b>	Adjust table, figure, equation, reference, citation, and punctuation etc.	17.2%

# Annotating Edits with Intention in arXivEdits



## Challenge

- Multiple edits may be tangled together in one sentence, while each edit is made for a different purpose.
- Correctly separating these edits can be tedious and complicated.

**Solution: Use Monolingual Word Alignment to Assist Annotation**

# Annotating Edits with Intention in **arXivEdits**

Step 1: Generate word alignment by neural semi-CRF word aligner for 1,000 sentence pairs.

Ask  × 3 to **manually correct word alignment**.

Step 2: Use simple heuristics to generate edits from gold word alignment.

Ask  × 2 to **manually inspect and correct edits**.

(1) Each edit should have a clear intention and relatively clear phrase boundaries.

(2) Span pairs in substitution should be semantically related.

Step 3: Ask  × 2 to **manually annotate intention** for the 2,122 edits from 1,000 pairs.

Inter-annotator agreement: 0.67 for 7-category (Cohen Kappa)

0.81 if collapsing the *Improve language* category

# Automatic Intention Classification

The performance of the best Performing T5-large model with a 79.3 accuracy on the fine-grained classification task.

Intention Label	Precision	Recall	F1
Adjust Format	96.7	94.6	95.6
Update Content	84.8	86.9	85.8
Fix Grammar/Typo	81.8	85.1	83.1
Language-Simplify	75.0	66.7	70.6
Language-Accurate	54.7	63.0	58.6
Language-style	46.9	37.5	41.7

[Please see our paper for more experiments](#)

# Our Work

A complete computational framework to study text revision in the scientific writing domain.

## arXivEdits

- Sentence alignment for 751 paper groups across 6 research areas in 23 years. **Full multi-page papers!**
- Fine-grained sentence level edits with intentions for 1,000 sentence pairs. **New intention taxonomy!**

## System

- Automatic sentence alignment. **Precision: 96.9; F1 93.8**
- Span-level edit extraction. **More explainable!**
- Edit intention classification.

## Data-driven Analysis


*What common strategies are used by authors to improve the writing of their papers?*

# Automatic Span-level Edit Extraction

- Formulated as a span alignment task.
- Our methods
  - semi-CRF word alignment model **Ours at ACL 2021!**
  - QA-Align ([Nagata et al., 2020](#))
  - Simple heuristics (see our paper for a parsing-based heuristics)
- Baseline: Latexdiff used by [Du et al., 2021](#).

# Semi-CRF Alignment Model

## Bi-directional Training / Decoding



Training objective:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}} -\log P(\mathbf{a}_{s2t} | \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) - \log P(\mathbf{a}_{t2s} | \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})$$

Source-to-target

Target-to-source

Decoding:

Viterbi-like Algorithm + Intersect + Expand

To handle spans longer than 3

# Automatic Span-level Edit Extraction



- Formulated as a span alignment task.
- Our methods
  - semi-CRF word alignment model **Ours at ACL 2021!**
  - QA-Align ([Nagata et al., 2020](#))
  - Simple heuristics (see our paper for a parsing-based heuristics)
- Baseline: Latexdiff used by [Du et al., 2021](#).

	Perf. (P/ R /F1)				% of Edit Types			Len. of Edits		
	P	R	F1	EM	Ins.	Del.	Sub.	Ins.	Del.	Sub.
Semi-CRF Aligner	87.5	87.7	87.6	80.5	32.9	26.7	40.4	4.66	4.98	2.21
QA-Align	87.7	88.4	88.0	82.0	33.2	24.0	42.9	4.46	4.62	2.08
Latexdiff	76.2	74.3	75.3	70.0	26.2	14.4	59.3	3.89	4.27	4.73

Latexdiff treats everything as large chunk substitutions



# Example Outputs from Our System



# Our Work

A complete computational framework to study text revision in the scientific writing domain.

## arXivEdits

- Sentence alignment for 751 paper groups across 6 research areas in 23 years. **Full multi-page papers!**
- Fine-grained sentence level edits with intentions for 1,000 sentence pairs. **New intention taxonomy!**


## System

- Automatic sentence alignment. **Precision: 96.9; F1 93.8**
- Span-level edit extraction. **More explainable!**
- Edit intention classification.

## Data-driven Analysis

*What common strategies are used by authors to improve the writing of their papers?*

# Overall Statistics for arXivEdits




- Physics and Math have the largest volume of multi-version papers.
- 26.7% papers have more than 2 versions available.

# How Much Content Has Been Updated?

Based on manually annotated sentence alignment.

$$\text{Update Ratio Between } V_i \text{ and } V_j = 1 - \frac{\# \text{ of kept sent.}}{\# \text{ of all sent. in } V_i}$$

**The Distribution of Update Ratio**




(a) Update Ratio Between the First and Last Versions of Each Paper

# How Much Content Has Been Updated?

Based on manually annotated sentence alignment.

$$\text{Update Ratio Between } V_i \text{ and } V_j = 1 - \frac{\# \text{ of kept sent.}}{\# \text{ of all sent. in } V_i}$$

Most papers w/ 2 versions undergo a mild revision.




(a) Update Ratio Between the First and Last Versions of Each Paper

# How Much Content Has Been Updated?

Based on manually annotated sentence alignment.

$$\text{Update Ratio Between } V_i \text{ and } V_j = 1 - \frac{\# \text{ of kept sent.}}{\# \text{ of all sent. in } V_i}$$

**The Distribution of Update Ratio**



Distribution is more flat for papers w/ more versions.


(a) Update Ratio Between the First and Last Versions of Each Paper

# How Much Content Has Been Updated?

Based on manually annotated sentence alignment.

$$\text{Update Ratio Between } V_i \text{ and } V_j = 1 - \frac{\# \text{ of kept sent.}}{\# \text{ of all sent. in } V_i}$$

**The Distribution of Update Ratio**




**3.7% of papers are almost completely re-written.**

(a) Update Ratio Between the First and Last Versions of Each Paper

# Update Ratio v.s. Area

Based on manually annotated sentence alignment.




- Researchers in Statistics make more significant revisions to their papers compared to the CS area.



# Where do Researchers Make the Edits?

Based on manually annotated sentence alignment.




- Researchers, in general, revise more sentences at the beginning of a paper, while the insertion and deletion of sentences occur more in the latter parts.

# Zoom in to the Revised Sentences — Why do Researchers Make the Span-level Edits?

Run our span-level edit extraction and intention classification modules on all the revised sentences between adjacent versions in 751 article groups.

Most of the language-related edits occur at the beginning of a paper.



The adjustments to format (punctuations, figures, tables, citations, etc.) span throughout the whole paper.

Please see our paper for more analysis!

# Summary

We provide a complete computational framework to study text revision in scientific writing domain.

# Summary

All techniques can be generalized to other domains!

We provide a complete computational framework to study text revision in scientific writing domain.

## arXivEdits

- Sentence alignment for 751 paper groups across 6 research areas in 23 years. Full multi-page papers!
- Fine-grained sentence level edits with intentions for 1,000 sentence pairs. New intention taxonomy!

System: (1) sentence alignment; (2) span-level edit extraction; (3) edit intention classification.

## Data-driven Analysis

*What common strategies are used by authors to improve the writing of their papers?*

Code/data at <https://tiny.one/arxivedits>

Email me at [chaojiang@gatech.edu](mailto:chaojiang@gatech.edu)

Follow me on Twitter  Chao Jiang  
@chaojiang06 